DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 396 HE 014 233

AUTHOR Regoli, Robert M.; Miracle, Andrew W., Jr.
TITLE Professionalism Among Criminal Justice Educators.
INSTITUTION Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 80
GRANT LEAA-79CD-AX-0001
NOTE 43p.; For related documents, see HE 014 228-235. Funded by the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training.
AVAILABLE FROM Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, University of Illinois, Box 4348, Chicago, IL 60680.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Criminology; Higher Education; Individual Development; Law Enforcement; *Productivity; Professional Associations; *Professional Personnel; Researchers; *Scholarly Journals; Scholarship; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Motivation
IDENTIFIERS Criminal Justice; *Professionalism

ABSTRACT

Professionalism and its relationship to scholarly productivity was studied. Specific areas of analysis were the degree of professionalism of criminal justice educators, rankings of a series of selected publications, and the relationship between professionalism level and journal productivity. Data were derived from responses by 1,028 of 1,274 criminal justice educators who were mailed a 69-item questionnaire. All respondents were currently involved in teaching and/or research positions in the United States. Using a modified form of Hall's Professionalism Scale, the degree of professionalism was rated for the following subscales: use of the professional organization as a major referent, belief in public service, autonomy, belief in self-regulation, and sense of calling to the field. A journal publication scale was developed to assess the respondents' journal productivity, taking into account both frequency of publishing and quality of publication. Journal weights (means and standards deviations) were calculated for each of the selected publications, and then weights were calculated separately for members of two professional organizations. The findings revealed that the criminal justice occupation lies in the upper-middle quadrant on the professions continuum (based on professionalism level scores). Extensive variation was found among the rankings of the selected criminal justice publications, and the relationship between professionalism level and journal productivity was negligible. The survey questionnaire and Hall's modified Professionalism Scale are appended. (SW)

HE 014 233

ED207396

Professionalism Among Criminal Justice Educators

Robert M. Regoli
and
Andrew W. Miracle, Jr.

March 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Joint Comm on Criminology & Criminal Justice Educ & Standards, Univ of Ill, Chicago TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for the
Joint Commission on Criminology and
Criminal Justice Education and Standards

Prepared under Grant Number 79CD-AX-0001
from the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training,
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,
U.S. Department of Justice

HE 014 233

Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards.

Joint Commission on Criminology
and Criminal Justice Education and Standards
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680

JOINT COMMISSION ON CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION AND STANDARDS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HARRY E. ALLEN
San Jose State University
Washington Square
San Jose, California 95192.

LARRY R. BASSI
SUNY—Brockport
Brockport, New York 14420

GEORGE T. FELKENES
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

EDITH FLYNN
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

C. RAY JEFFERY
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

WILLIAM J. MATHIAS
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

RICHTER H. MOORE JR.
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

FRANK SCARPITTI
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

PROJECT DIRECTOR

RICHARD H. WARD
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

VINCENT J. WEBB
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Contents

Preface	5
Abstract	7
Professionalism Among Criminal Justice Educators	9
Methodology	11
Results	14
Summary/Conclusions	34
Notes	35
References	36
Appendix A	37
Appendix B	43

Preface

The major goal of the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards is to conduct and support research which contributes to improving the quality of criminology and criminal justice education. In addition to efforts of the Joint Commission's staff, a number of scholars around the country have received support from the Joint Commission in order to pursue research on issues surrounding criminology and criminal justice education.

This monograph, which examines professionalism and its relationship to scholarly productivity, represents an attempt at exploring some of the major dimensions of the occupational role and orientation of those who deliver criminology and criminal justice education. Of the multitude of tasks involved in improving the quality of an educational field, one of the most important is critical self-examination. Such examination can serve as a foundation upon which the profession can improve and develop. As the authors suggest, the field ". . . must learn more about itself, its members, and its publications, if the discipline expects to either professionally socialize neophytes or inform outsiders of the discipline's focus." The Joint Commission hopes that the work of Professors Regoli and Miracle will serve as a point of departure which the field can use in arriving at a better understanding of itself.

The views of the authors are their own and may vary from those held by the Joint Commission. It is hoped that this monograph will generate discussion and debate that will be useful in advancing the quality of criminology and criminal justice education.

Vincent J. Webb
Principal Investigator

Abstract

Criminal justice is an emerging academic discipline. Like other emergent disciplines, criminal justice must examine its programs, faculty, students, and associated activities.

The research reported here addresses three issues: (1) the professional level of criminal justice educators; (2) rankings of a series of selected publications; (3) the relationship between professionalism level and journal productivity.

Data were derived from responses by 1028 of 1274 criminal justice educators to a 69-item mail questionnaire. All respondents were currently involved in teaching and/or research positions; all were employed in the United States.

The findings of the research revealed that (1) the criminal justice occupation lies in the upper-middle quadrant on the professions continuum (based on professionalism level scores), (2) extensive variation exists among the rankings of the selected criminal justice publications, and (3) the relationship between professionalism level and journal productivity is negligible.

Professionalism Among Criminal Justice Educators

Criminal justice [1] is emerging as an autonomous academic discipline, apart from sociology, psychology, political science, and the like. In part, this autonomy is observed when noting either the emergence of "new" criminal justice programs on university campuses or when noting the increasing number of existing programs opting to remove themselves from being contained within a parent discipline (e.g., being housed in a "Department of Sociology"). The net result of such changes has been a precipitous increase (over the last 15 years) in the number of programs offering criminal justice degrees.

As a result of the movement for academic autonomy, criminal justice programs, faculties, and students have been subjected to continuous and rigorous evaluations by other academicians. Academicians from traditional disciplines have often been harsh in their criticisms. For example, the curricula of criminal justice programs have been scoffed at as being too "technically-oriented." The credentials of criminal justice educators have been questioned, severely in many cases. Doubts have been voiced about the ability of criminal justice students to analyze abstract subject matter. Academicians from traditional disciplines have been heard referring to a criminal justice program as: (1) the weakest on campus, (2) the program housing the Neanderthals on campus, or (3) some combination and/or extension of the two. An oft-noted reaction by criminal justice faculty has been, "they are simply jealous; our enrollments are increasing, theirs are not." In part, this is true, yet it further damages relations between criminal justice and other programs. For example, some "outsiders" (Becker, 1973) counter with a rationale such as the following one: "The criminal justice program is experiencing enrollment increases because whereas our faculty challenges students, theirs cannot. All they can hope is for their students to know the difference between blood and ketchup!" Without digressing, to a "blow-by-blow" description of such clashes, it suffices to say, the battle goes; little is achieved.

We contend criminal justice programs, faculties, and students must demonstrate their merit and worthiness on a university's campus; proclamation by a state legislature is not sufficient. After all, criminal justice programs are akin to the "new kid on the block"; acceptance does not come easily, in part because others do not know what to expect. Unfortunately, the avenue through which many criminal justice programs have sought acceptance (increased student enrollments) has not always proved effective in calming the waters between them and other university programs. This situation is made exceedingly more complex

when criminal justice faculty members seek out alternative avenues of acceptance; often finding them blocked. We have observed situations (as have our colleagues) where a criminal justice faculty member's work is evaluated by a panel of outside referees, and not only is the work derided but the panel asserts that while the work is perhaps satisfactory (for criminal justice), it nevertheless is inferior to the university's standard. The implication here is explicit. Criminal justice faculty are academically able to compete only on a scaled-down version of the university's requirements.

The situation is not as bleak as presented. All emergent disciplines have struggled in their formative years for acceptance; criminal justice is no exception. In fact, a well defined *rite de passage* emergent disciplines go through to (1) acquire university membership and (2) be accorded the informal stamp of "academic respectability" is apparent. In many states, prior to a program being presented to students, it must be justified as meritorious by outsiders (e.g., the dean, vice-president, president, board of regents, state legislature). Formal acceptance is not easily acquired. Anywhere along the line the program can be derailed, stalled, or delayed, by whomever, for whatever reason(s). Not only can the program be terminated, but once approved, its curriculum faces continuous opposition, evaluation, and challenges. Any person previously involved in curriculum development can attest to this difficulty. One can imagine the difficulties encountered by those assembling an entire degree granting program. Nevertheless, many criminal justice programs have gained formal acceptance, have had a curriculum approved (although quite often not the one initially envisioned), and are functionally operating.

Once a program commences operation an initial goal is to establish informal academic acceptance. To do so, faculty of the program must be cognizant of the requirements. In the early going, it is not uncommon for the program and its faculty to fall under the paternalistic purview of the university's "gatekeepers" of academic freedom and excellence. These gatekeepers, observing closely the program's operation, its faculty and students, are quick to criticize and slow to compliment—but they always make certain their presence is known. In some ways the situation is analogous to that of the inmate and prison guard (Poole and Regoli, 1980). Guards keep a watchful eye on inmates, seldom praising work done well, yet they are quick to write infraction (incident) reports for specific aberrant behaviors, and all along, the guards make certain the inmate knows he is there.

Criminal justice educators have focused their energy almost entirely on developing programs. Generally, they have not concentrated on academic quality, nor on establishing ties with other disciplines. In fact, at many universities the criminal justice program has withdrawn, seeking complete autonomy, and reclusion. In part, criminal justice educators are to blame for the strained relations with those from other disciplines. One reason is that criminal justice educators have failed to promote themselves as academicians and their discipline as an academic one. After all, among most of a university's scholars, a department's merit is not measured by student enrollments but rather by the faculties' credentials (e.g., highest degree, degree granting institution) the prestige of journals in which they publish, and involvement in professional associations. If criminal justice programs and faculties are ever to be informally accepted, they must compete against other university faculty and programs in terms of the established (institutionalized) normative structure.

Generally this has not occurred, and where it has, the criminal justice faculty have often fallen short of the mark.

Criminal justice educators can correct this situation. A place to start is with research focusing on the "state of the art," or the professionalism level of the occupation's members. Once the professionalism level is established, and we have some idea of where the discipline lies on the professions continuum, we can assess it in relation to other disciplines.

Criminal justice educators have traditionally rejected doing research examining their occupation, apparently feeling such research is worthless in comparison to research focusing on crime, for example. We disagree; such research is essential, especially for an emergent discipline. The purpose of the research project undertaken here is threefold. First, we assess the professionalism level of criminal justice educators. Second, we offer a ranking of selected criminal justice publications. Third, the relationship (if any) between professionalism and journal publication productivity is estimated. Addressing issues as these is critical for criminal justice. Criminal justice must learn more about itself, its members, and its publications, if the discipline expects to either professionally socialize neophytes or inform outsiders of the discipline's focus.

Methodology

Sample

Data for the project were derived from responses of 1028 of 1274 members of the American Society of Criminology (ASC) and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS); 366 respondents were ASC members; 368 respondents were ACJS members; 276 respondents held membership in both ASC and ACJS (ASC/ACJS).[2] The following analysis assesses differences among these membership categories.

Research Procedures

Each potential respondent was initially sent a survey packet containing (1) a letter explaining the research purpose, (2) a survey questionnaire, and (3) a business-reply return envelope. One week later, each was sent a post card follow-up. The post card served as a thank you for those already having returned their questionnaire, and as a reminder for those who had not. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a second survey packet was mailed out to those not yet returning their questionnaire. The second mailing packet was identical to the first, except the cover letter stressed the importance of the subject for the validity of the research project.

The mailing survey technique adopted here is similar to that prescribed by Dillman (1978), the Total Design Method (TDM), but because of specific limitations, we were unable to fully implement Dillman's approach. Nevertheless, although we omitted several of his techniques (e.g., sending a fourth mailing to non-respondents via certified mail), we realized a response rate to our questionnaire exceeding 80 percent (1028/1274). Had we implemented all techniques advanced by Dillman we are certain the overall survey response rate would have exceeded 85 percent.

Questionnaire

Following Dillman (1978), the questionnaire was photo-reduced and presented to the sampled members in a vertical flow format. The questionnaire was five pages long, divided into three parts containing 69 items. Part one consisted of 30 Likert scale items assessing professionalism (Hall, 1968; Snizek, 1972) and work alienation (Miller, 1967). Part two asked respondents to (1) rank a series of criminal justice publications, and (2) show the frequency they had published in each. Part three focused on certain of the respondents' demographic attributes (16 items).

Measurement of Variables

The key variables in this research are (1) professionalism (2) journal rankings, and (3) journal productivity. Below we explain how each is conceptualized and operationalized in this research.

At the outset, professionalism and related concepts must be defined. We ascribe to the position advanced by Vollmer and Mills (1966). A "profession" is an ideal type, not existing in reality, but to which all occupations strive. All occupations can be located on a continuum, ranging from being less professional to being more professional. Thus, we avoid discussing whether or not a particular occupation (e.g., criminal justice educators) is a profession, but rather, identify where an occupation lies on the continuum. "Professionalization" refers to the (dynamic) process where an occupation changes in directions consistent with being a profession. "Professionalism" is an ideology and associated activities that can be found in numerous occupational groups where members strive for professional status. Our focus here, is on the concept professionalism, by examining a specific activity, journal publication productivity.

Several ways exist to assess the extent an occupation is professionalized, or in other words, where an occupation lies on the continuum. One might examine an occupation historically and note the changes consistent with professionalization having taken place. Concomitantly, structural changes across occupations could be compared and contrasted, inasmuch as they demonstrate that an occupation is further along the profession's continuum than is another one. In the present study we have rejected using this type of approach and have opted for a more quantitative, empirical one.

We feel a quantitative approach is best suited for addressing the research questions initially posed. Our position is consistent with the one advanced by Ritzer (1973:70) when he notes "the more professional the occupation, the more likely the individuals in that occupation are to be professional at the individual level." As is Ritzer's, our focus is on individual professionalism.

One way of assessing individual professionalism is by making Hall's (1968) professionalism scale, as revised by Snizek (1972) occupationally specific. (The complete modified scale is shown in Apendix B.) This scale taps five dimensions of professionalism: (1) use of the professional organization as a major referent, (2) belief in public service, (3) belief in autonomy, (4) belief in self-regulation, and (5) sense of calling to the field. The revised professionalism scale contains 25 Likert scale items; five for each subscale. All responses are scored on a five-point continuum. Professionalism level scores could range from 5 (low) to 25 (high) for each subscale. For all subscales, the higher the scale score, the greater the professionalism on the dimension. Each subscale is described below.

Use of the Professional Organization as a Major Referent (ORGAN)

This dimension of professionalism focuses on the degree to which practitioners use the formal or informal organization as a major source of ideas and judgments for decisions. Professional associations reinforce values, beliefs, and identities within a profession. By attending professional meetings and reading journals, workers develop "colleague consciousness." Consequently, they are influenced by standards of their profession (Gross, 1958). (See Items 1-5 in Appendix B.)

Belief in Public Service (PUBLIC)

"Professionals" believe their occupation is indispensible and beneficial to society (Gross, 1958). But, in some instances, outsiders may not be convinced of the indispensibility of services performed by the occupation. Newcomers may therefore be slow to develop this belief. Nevertheless, the degree to which this orientation develops is an indicator of professionalism. (See Items 6-10 in Appendix B.)

Autonomy (AUTO)

Autonomy involves a professional belief that individuals must make their own decisions regarding their work. Practitioners believe they should be free from external pressures in determining what or how work is to be done (Gross, 1958). (See Items 11-15 in Appendix B.)

Belief in Self-Regulation (SELFREG)

Another dimension of professionalism is the belief that the person best able to judge the work of a professional is a fellow professional. Gross (1958) calls this "colleague control." Because of the state of specialized knowledge in their field, only colleagues, not outsiders, are able to judge the quality of their work. (See Items 16-20 in Appendix B.)

Sense of Calling to the Field (CALLING)

This dimension of professionalism reflects practitioners' dedication to their work. Professionals will perform their work even when few extrinsic rewards are available, doing it for psychological gratification. Work is defined as an end in itself, not merely a means to an end (Gross, 1958). (See Items 21-25 in Appendix B.)

Journal Publication Scale (JPS)

The journal publication scale reflects the respondents' journal productivity. When developing the JPS scale our goal was to construct a discriminating index: simultaneously taking both frequency of publishing and quality of publication into account.

To accomplish this, the mean evaluative weight for each journal was first multiplied by the number of articles that the respondent reported having published in each respective journal. For example, if a respondent had published once each in *Social Problems*, *Criminology*, and the *Journal of Criminal Justice*, the summated score would be $(1) \cdot (10.94) + (1) \cdot (10.23) + (1) \cdot (9.09) = 30.26$ (see Table 5).[3] The resulting values were then subjected to a principal component factor analysis. No rotation was performed since a single factor solution was assumed. The factor loading for each journal was multiplied by its standardized score and the products were summed. Respondents' score (in the JPS scale) thus represents a weighted composite of the frequency and quality of their self-reported journal publications.[4]

Statistical Procedures

To address the reseach questions posed, varying statistical techniques were utilized. Professionalism was assessed by examining summated scale scores, subscale scores, and item scores, for each respondent. Means and standard deviations are reported.

Journal weights (means and standard deviations) were initially calculated for each of the selected publications, and then weights (means and standard deviations) were calculated separately for ASC, ACJS, and ASC/ACJS members. These rankings were supplemented with rankings assessing differences (if any) between those having published in the journal and those who have not.

The relationship between professionalism and journal productivity was estimated via stepwise multiple regression procedures, with professionalism (and its variant subscales) conceptualized as the independent variable and journal productivity the dependent one.[5]

Results

Research results are presented in Table 1 through Table 15. Table 1 through Table 4 address the professionalism level of criminal justice educators. The highest professionalism level is observed for ASC members ($\bar{X}$ = 68.94; sd = 10.40) (Table 2), followed by ASC/ACJS members ($\bar{X}$ = 68.38; sd = 11.29) (Table 4), and ACJS members ($\bar{X}$ = 67.60; sd = 10.06) (Table 3). The overall professionalism score mean is 68.33 (sd = 10.52). Examining interscale differences, we see that regardless of membership category (ASC, ACJS, or ASC/ACJS), the highest professionalism subscale scores are on the PUBLIC dimension; differences on the remaining professionalism subscales among membership categories are negligible (see Tables 2-4).

Intracategory comparisons (omitting the PUBLIC subscale), reveal that among ASC members (Table 2) the next highest scoring professionalism subscale is CALLING ($\bar{X}$ = 15.33; sd = 3.65), followed by SELFREG ($\bar{X}$ = 12.88; sd = 3.87), AUTO ($\bar{X}$ = 11.81; sd = 3.51) and ORGAN ($\bar{X}$ = 11.35; sd = 3.09). For ASC/ACJS members (Table 4) the ordering is identical, although the means and standard deviations changed (CALLING: $\bar{X}$ = 15.42; sd = 3.69; AUTO: $\bar{X}$ = 12.08; sd = 3.75; ORGAN: $\bar{X}$ = 10.72; sd = 3.32). For ACJS members (Table 3), the ordering of the subscales is similar, except AUTO ($\bar{X}$ = 11.68) shows a lower mean subscale score than ORGAN ($\bar{X}$ = 11.72); but the difference is slight. Data presented in Table 1 through Table 4 suggests that differences either between and/or among membership categories are negligible; members of each category appear equally professional.

Table 5 reports the journal weights assigned by the total sample (N = 1028). As seen in the table, weights ranged from 11.82 (high) for the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) to 5.74 (low) for *Police*, suggesting that respondents viewed an ASR publication about twice as beneficial to the discipline as one in *Police*. Table 5 also offers a measure of journal recognition. (Glenn (1971) refers to this as the "extensity" factor.) To the left of each journal's weight a number is shown (in parentheses). This number shows the actual number of respondents weighting the journal. This number reflects how well-known the publication is by the membership; the higher the number the greater the recognition. The journal most respondents recognized was *Crime and Delinquency* (79.8 percent recogni-

Table 1
Professionalism Scores for the Sample (N = 1028)

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
ORGAN	11.32	3.21
I believe the professional organizations should be supported.	1.62	.68
I systematically read the professional journals.	2.26	1.04
I regularly attend the professional meetings at the national and/or regional level.	2.25	1.18
The professional organizations do not really do too much for the average academician.	2.96	1.20
Although I would like to, I really don't read the professional journals too often.	2.24	1.07
PUBLIC	16.81	3.89
If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one.	2.76	1.30
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine is.	3.93	.93
The importance of being an academician is sometimes overstressed.	3.22	1.21
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.	3.33	1.22
Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine is.	3.58	1.08
AUTO	11.88	3.42
I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.	2.01	.91
I don't have an opportunity to exercise my own judgment.	1.68	.81
My own decisions are subject to review.	3.57	1.14
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.	2.19	1.10
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people in the institution in which I work.	2.46	1.15

Table 1 continued

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
SELFREG	13.30	3.89
My fellow academicians pretty much know how well we all do in our work.	3.09	1.12
There is not much opportunity to judge how another academician does his/her work.	2.57	1.14
A problem in my profession is that no one really knows what his fellow academicians are doing.	2.91	1.16
My fellow academicians have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.	2.80	1.21
There is really no way to judge a fellow academician's competence.	1.93	.86
CALLING	14.98	3.61
There are very few academicians who don't really believe in their work.	2.92	1.09
Most academicians would remain in the profession even if their salaries were reduced.	3.03	1.17
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by the members of my department.	3.14	1.24
The dedication of academicians in my discipline is most gratifying.	2.76	1.15
People in my profession have a real "calling" for their work.	3.14	1.06
OVERALL PROFESSIONALISM	68.33	10.52

Table 2
Professionalism Scores for ASC members (N = 368)

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
ORGAN	11.35	3.09
I believe the professional organizations should be supported.	1.72	.74
I systematically read the professional journals.	2.18	1.03
I regularly attend the professional meetings at the national and/or regional level.	2.33	1.22
The professional organizations do not really do too much for the average academician	2.99	1.17
Although I would like to, I really don't read the professional journals too often.	2.13	1.00
PUBLIC	17.58	3.59
If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one.	3.02	1.24
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine is.	4.05	.88
The importance of being an academician is sometimes overstressed.	3.22	1.21
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.	3.57	1.13
Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine is.	3.73	1.01
AUTO	11.81	3.51
I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.	2.02	.92
I don't have an opportunity to exercise my own judgment.	1.70	.84
My own decisions are subject to review.	3.44	1.19
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.	2.22	1.11
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people in the institution in which I work.	2.42	1.15

Table 2 continued

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
SELFREG	12.88	3.87
My fellow academicians pretty much know how well we all do in our work.	3.03	1.12
There is not much opportunity to judge how another academician does his/her work.	2.43	1.10
A problem in my profession is that no one really knows what his fellow academicians are doing.	2.80	1.16
There is really no way to judge a fellow academician's competence.	1.89	.89
CALLING	15.33	3.65
There are very few academicians who don't really believe in their work.	2.97	1.07
Most academicians would remain in the profession even if their salaries were reduced.	2.89	1.12
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by the members of my department.	3.37	1.22
The dedication of academicians in my discipline is most gratifying.	2.85	1.16
People in my profession have a real "calling" for their work.	3.24	1.08
OVERALL PROFESSIONALISM	68.94	10.40

Table 3
Professionalism Scores for ACJS Members (N = 368)

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
ORGAN	11.72	3.20
I believe the professional organizations should be supported.	1.56	.61
I systematically read the professional journals.	2.41	1.05
I regularly attend the professional meetings at the national and/or regional level.	2.39	1.18
The professional organizations do not really do too much for the average academician.	2.93	1.18
Although I would like to, I really don't read the professional journals too often.	2.43	1.12
PUBLIC	16.04	3.94
If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one.	2.45	1.28
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine is.	3.80	.96
The importance of being an academician is sometimes overstressed.	3.26	1.21
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.	3.11	1.28
Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine is.	3.42	1.10
AUTO	11.68	3.01
I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.	2.02	.86
I don't have an opportunity to exercise my own judgment.	1.65	.74
My own decisions are subject to review.	3.61	1.08
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.	2.09	1.03
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people in the institution in which I work.	2.42	1.08

Table 3 continued

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
SELFREG	113.73	3.79
My fellow academicians pretty much know how well we all do in our work.	3.14	1.09
There is not much opportunity to judge how another academician does his/her work.	2.76	1.13
A problem in my profession is that no one really knows what his fellow academicians are doing.	3.09	1.56
My fellow academicians have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.	2.82	1.23
There is really no way to judge a fellow academician's competence.	2.01	.86
CALLING	14.31	3.46
There are very few academicians who don't really believe in their work.	2.78	1.08
Most academicians would remain in the profession even if their salaries were reduced.	3.15	1.89
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by the members of my department.	2.88	1.18
The dedication of academicians in my discipline is most gratifying.	2.52	1.05
People in my profession have a real "calling" for their work.	2.98	1.05
OVERALL PROFESSIONALISM	67.60	10.06

Table 4
Professionalism Scores for ASC/ACJS Members (N = 276)

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
ORGAN	10.72	3.32
I believe the professional organizations should be supported.	1.54	.66
I systematically read the professional journals.	2.17	1.01
I regularly attend the professional meetings at the national and/or regional level.	1.96	1.08
The professional organizations do not really do too much for the average academician.	2.95	1.25
Although I would like to, I really don't read the professional journals too often.	2.11	1.06
PUBLIC	16.81	3.97
If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one.	2.81	1.32
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine is.	3.96	.93
The importance of being an academician is sometimes overstressed.	3.14	1.23
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.	3.32	1.19
Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine is.	3.59	1.10
AUTO	12.08	3.75
I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.	1.99	.97
I don't have an opportunity to exercise my own judgment.	1.68	.84
My own decisions are subject to review.	3.66	1.14
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.	2.25	1.17
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people in the institution in which I work.	2.53	1.20

Table 4 continued

Subscale	$\bar{X}$	SD
SELFREG	13.32	3.96
My fellow academicians pretty much know how well we all do in our work.	3.09	1.16
There is not much opportunity to judge how another academician does his/her work.	2.54	1.14
A problem in my profession is that no one really knows what his fellow academicians are doing.	2.93	1.17
My fellow academicians have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.	2.86	1.21
There is really no way to judge a fellow academician's competence.	1.89	.82
CALLING	15.42	3.69
There are very few academicians who don't really believe in their work.	3.05	1.12
Most academicians would remain in the profession even if their salaries were reduced.	3.07	1.20
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by the members of my department.	3.17	1.31
The dedication of academicians in my discipline is most gratifying.	2.91	1.19
People in my profession have a real "calling" for their work.	3.22	1.04
OVERALL PROFESSIONALISM	68.38	11.29

Table 5
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by the Total Sample (N = 1028)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. American Sociological Review	11.82	(701)	8.24
2. American Journal of Sociology	11.20	(724)	7.07
3. Social Problems	10.94	(635)	6.21
4. Criminology	10.23	(767)	4.63
5. Law and Society Review	10.23	(512)	5.81
6. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency	10.15	(652)	4.08
7. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
8. British Journal of Criminology	9.64	(563)	4.79
9. Crime and Delinquency	9.54	(819)	3.71
10. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.09	(647)	3.94
11. Crime and Social Justice	8.57	(420)	6.21
12. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	8.33	(597)	4.40
13. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.28	(405)	4.14
14. Law & Human Behavior	8.23	(310)	4.70
15. Criminal Justice & Behavior	7.76	(388)	3.90
16. Federal Probation	7.51	(735)	4.48
17. Criminal Justice Review	7.47	(439)	3.41
18. Acta Criminologica	6.60	(324)	3.62
19. Abstracts on Police Science	6.46	(404)	6.29
20. American J. of Corrections	6.39	(624)	4.05
21. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	5.83	(372)	3.00
22. Police Chief	5.76	(639)	4.36
23. Police	5.74	(541)	4.76

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

tion), followed by the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS) (70 percent recognition); the least recognized publication was *Law and Human Behavior* (30 percent recognition).

Table 5 does not address other equally salient issues. For example, we cannot determine whether or not there is variation among membership categories in their rankings. Nor can we tell if those publishing in a journal rank it differently than those who have not. Questions like these are addressed in Table 6 through Table 14.

Table 6 through Table 8 present the weights assigned by the total ASC membership (Table 6), ASC members not publishing in the journal (Table 7), and ASC members publishing in the journal (Table 8). In Table 6, the three highest ranking journals are the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) ($\bar{X}$ = 13.68, sd = 9.23), followed by the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS) ($\bar{X}$ = 12.85, sd = 7.98), and *Social Problems* ($\bar{X}$ = 12.39, sd = 6.67). Each is a traditionally sociological publication. Journals showing the most respondent recognition were *Criminology* (84 percent), *Crime and Delinquency* (CD) (83 percent), and *AJS* (79.5 percent). Table 7 reports the journal weights assigned by ASC members not publishing in the journal. The three most highly weighted journals are the same as reported in Table 6, with the means and standard deviations changing minimally. Finally, in Table 8, the weights assigned by ASC members publishing in the journal are shown. Here, variation from the data presented in Tables 6 and 7 is noted. Among ASC publishers, *Social Problems* ($\bar{X}$ = 17.05, sd = 9.29), *Law and Society Review* ($\bar{X}$ = 15.00, sd = 15.58), and *ASR* ($\bar{X}$ = 15.00, sd = 8.96) are the most highly weighted.

Next, examining similar categories among ACJS members, we look to Table 9 through Table 11. Table 9 shows that the three highest ranking journals (omitting the standard, the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (JCLC)) were the *Journal of Criminal Justice* (JCJ) ($\bar{X}$ = 9.89, sd = 3.98), the *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* (JRCD) ($\bar{X}$ = 9.79, sd = 4.21), and the *Journal of Police Science and Administration* (JPSA) ($\bar{X}$ = 9.65, sd = 4.32). Concomitantly, journals having the greatest recognition factor included *Police Chief* (76.6 percent), *CD* (72.6 percent), and *JCJ* (71.5 percent). Observing Table 10, we see that for non-publishing ACJS members, the ordering of the three journals having the highest weights remains as it did in Table 9; only the means and standard deviations changed. But when looking at Table 11 (ACJS publishers), the most striking finding is the small number of publications listed. For this category, only 4 journals were published in five or more times (criterion to have weight reported) by ACJS members.

Finally, to examine the rankings assigned by ASC/ACJS members we look to Table 12 through Table 14. The overall weights (Table 12) assigned by joint members, as well as journal recognition numbers, most closely approximate weights and recognition assigned by ASC members (Table 6). Although the correspondence is imperfect, considerable similarity does exist. Similarly, among the non-publishing ASC/ACJS members (Table 13), the ordering of the highest ranking journals are similar to those observed for ASC non-publishers (Table 7). But among ASC/ACJS non-publishers, differences are noted from those reported for ASC publishers (Table 8). However, based on weights presented in Table 12 and 13, we are certain the differences between ASC/ACJS publishers and ASC publishers (Table 8) is a function of the joint members not having sufficiently published in either ASR or AJS to allow reporting their respective weights.

Table 6
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ASC Members (N = 366)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. American Sociological Review	13.68	(286)	9.23
2. American Journal of Sociology	12.85	(291)	7.98
3. Social Problems	12.39	(268)	6.67
4. Law and Society Review	10.95	(221)	6.27
5. Criminology	10.19	(308)	4.19
6. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
7. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency	9.99	(268)	3.88
8. British Journal of Criminology	9.81	(246)	4.61
9. Crime and Delinquency	9.18	(304)	3.57
10. Crime and Social Justice	8.65	(162)	6.91
11. Law & Human Behavior	8.32	(126)	5.62
12. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.16	(165)	3.89
13. Journal of Criminal Justice	7.39	(166)	3.96
14. Criminal Justice & Behavior	7.13	(141)	3.41
15. Federal Probation	6.95	(289)	3.94
16. Acta Criminologica	6.50	(138)	3.90
17. Criminal Justice Review	6.30	(129)	3.28
18. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	6.23	(156)	3.07
19. American J. of Corrections	5.88	(220)	3.74
20. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	5.19	(103)	2.64
21. Abstracts on Police Science	5.04	(113)	7.79
22. Police	4.38	(142)	2.84
23. Police Chief	4.30	(153)	3.37

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 7
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ASC Members (not publishing in the journal)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. American Sociological Review	13.36	(259)	8.98
2. American Journal of Sociology	12.58	(273)	7.81
3. Social Problems	11.74	(235)	6.10
4. Law and Society Review	10.62	(204)	4.68
5. Criminology	10.15	(244)	4.18
6. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
7. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency	9.95	(237)	3.90
8. British Journal of Criminology	9.90	(231)	4.71
9. Crime and Delinquency	9.18	(260)	3.68
10. Crime and Social Justice	8.28	(156)	6.15
11. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.11	(138)	3.90
12. Law & Human Behavior	8.08	(121)	4.93
13. Journal of Criminal Justice	7.48	(145)	4.07
14. Criminal Justice & Behavior	6.90	(129)	3.12
15. Federal Probation	6.69	(251)	3.80
16. Acta Criminologica	6.47	(136)	3.85
17. Criminal Justice Review	6.31	(118)	3.39
18. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	6.10	(146)	3.11
19. American J. of Corrections	5.99	(206)	3.76
20. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	5.13	(88)	2.76
21. Abstracts on Police Science	5.01	(111)	7.86
22. Police	4.42	(136)	2.86
23. Police Chief	4.32	(144)	3.44

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 8
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ASC Members (publishing in the journal)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]	SD
1. Social Problems	17.05 (19)	9.29
2. Law & Society Review	15.00 (17)	15.58
3. American Sociological Review	15.00 (11)	8.96
4. Law & Human Behavior	14.20 (5)	1.46
5. American Journal of Sociology	12.64 (11)	6.50
6. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00	
7. Criminology	9.44 (39)	3.73
8. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	9.38 (21)	3.43
9. Crime and Delinquency	9.00 (30)	2.75
10. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.40 (21)	4.25
11. Criminal Justice & Behavior	8.28 (9)	4.85
12. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	8.13 (8)	1.46
13. British Journal of Criminology	8.08 (13)	2.06
14. Federal Probation	7.68 (22)	3.17
15. Journal of Criminal Justice	6.88 (17)	3.47
16. Criminal Justice Review	6.00 (8)	1.85
17. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	5.33 (12)	1.87
18. Police Chief	4.80 (5)	1.79
19. American J. of Corrections	4.64 (11)	3.20

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 9
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ACJS Members (n = 368)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
2. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.89	(263)	3.98
3. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	9.79	(170)	4.21
4. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	9.65	(247)	4.32
5. Crime and Delinquency	9.37	(267)	3.64
6. Criminology	9.18	(209)	3.62
7. Law & Society Review	9.11	(123)	6.09
8. American Sociological Review	9.09	(190)	4.89
9. British Journal of Criminology	8.91	(129)	4.88
10. American Journal of Sociology	8.88	(206)	4.67
11. Social Problems	8.71	(157)	4.25
12. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.37	(97)	4.95
13. Criminal Justice Review	8.33	(168)	3.32
14. Law & Human Behavior	8.31	(81)	4.45
15. Criminal Justice & Behavior	8.10	(106)	3.46
16. Crime and Social Justice	8.09	(116)	3.45
17. Federal Probation	7.77	(216)	5.25
18. American J. of Corrections	7.53	(205)	4.82
19. Abstracts on Police Science	7.53	(170)	6.43
20. Police Chief	7.06	(282)	6.09
21. Police	6.86	(229)	4.38
22. Acta Criminologica	6.19	(80)	2.99
23. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	6.09	(126)	4.05

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 10
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ACJS Members (not publishing in the journal)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
2. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.90	(248)	4.03
3. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	9.78	(169)	4.22
4. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	9.46	(228)	4.25
5. Crime and Delinquency	9.35	(264)	3.64
6. Criminology	9.22	(204)	3.64
7. American Sociological Review	9.11	(189)	4.90
8. Law & Society Review	9.10	(122)	4.47
9. British Journal of Criminology	8.98	(128)	4.84
10. American Journal of Sociology	8.87	(206)	4.67
11. Social Problems	8.64	(154)	4.23
12. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.37	(97)	4.95
13. Criminal Justice Review	8.33	(164)	3.34
14. Law & Human Behavior	8.29	(80)	4.45
15. Crime and Social Justice	8.09	(116)	3.45
16. Criminal Justice & Behavior	8.09	(105)	3.47
17. Federal Probation	7.79	(211)	5.30
18. American J. of Corrections	7.56	(201)	4.85
19. Abstracts on Police Science	7.49	(167)	6.48
20. Police Chief	6.87	(242)	4.32
21. Police	6.73	(214)	6.12
22. Acta Criminologica	6.19	(79)	3.01
23. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	6.13	(123)	2.96

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 11
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ACJS Members (publishing in the journal)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
2. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	13.17	(12)	5.41
3. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.77	(13)	3.44
4. Police	7.67	(9)	4.95
5. Police Chief	6.95	(21)	3.35

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Looking across Table 6 through Table 14, considerable variation is shown on the ordering of journals by ASC, ASC/ACJS, and ACJS members. As pointed out above, ASC/ACJS members' weights were most closely aligned with those assigned by ASC. The obvious finding across the tables is the tendency for both the ASC and ASC/ACJS categories to rank the more sociological publications higher than ACJS members, and conversely, for ACJS members to weight the criminal justice publications more highly. But, there is consistency on weights assigned for publications receiving the lowest weights (Tables 6, 9, and 12).

Finally, looking at the relationship between professionalism level and journal productivity, Table 15 shows that the relationship is negligible. Yet, four of the five professionalism subscales (AUTO, ORGAN, PUBLIC, and SELFREG) are significantly related to journal productivity. The table tells us that the less the belief in AUTONOMY (B = −.12), or the less one uses the professional organization (B = −.10), or the less one believes in self-regulation service (B = −.06), or the greater the belief in public service (B = .09)—the greater the journal productivity. These results are theoretically confusing. Based on them, at this point, we argue that since only 4 percent of the variance in journal productivity is explained (by all five professionalism dimensions—AUTO is the most dominant; that while the reported beta weights are statistically significant—because of sample size), they are substantively meaningless. Findings such as these call for future research focusing on the effect (if any) professionalism has on not only journal productivity, but also associated activities, as well, perhaps additional analysis of existing data.

Table 12
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ASC/ACJS Members
(N = 276)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. American Sociological Review	11.57	(216)	8.41
2. Criminology	11.23	(243)	5.63
3. American Journal of Sociology	10.99	(219)	6.99
4. Social Problems	10.77	(202)	6.42
5. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	10.60	(204)	4.15
6. Crime and Delinquency	10.24	(236)	3.91
7. Law and Society Review	10.22	(164)	6.01
8. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
9. British Journal of Criminology	9.88	(179)	5.00
10. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.38	(211)	3.43
11. Crime and Social Justice	8.78	(138)	7.11
12. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	8.36	(187)	4.79
13. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.31	(141)	3.75
14. Criminal Justice & Behavior	8.13	(135)	4.64
15. Law & Human Behavior	7.91	(99)	4.07
16. Federal Probation	7.89	(220)	4.21
17. Criminal Justice Review	7.49	(136)	3.38
18. Acta Criminologica	6.97	(103)	3.62
19. Abstracts on Police Science	6.08	(115)	3.57
20. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	5.97	(138)	3.18
21. American J. of Corrections	5.73	(191)	3.17
22. Police	5.29	(158)	3.46
23. Police Chief	4.73	(193)	3.16

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 13
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ASC/ACJS Members (not publishing in the journal)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. American Sociological Review	11.55	(213)	8.45
2. Criminology	11.32	(202)	5.60
3. American Journal of Sociology	10.87	(217)	6.89
4. Social Problems	10.61	(190)	6.17
5. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	10.58	(191)	4.16
6. Crime and Delinquency	10.30	(204)	3.91
7. Law and Society Review	10.01	(162)	5.66
8. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
9. British Journal of Criminology	9.84	(173)	5.07
10. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.39	(178)	3.54
11. Crime and Social Justice	8.78	(138)	7.11
12. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	8.20	(129)	3.85
13. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	8.04	(157)	3.82
14. Criminal Justice & Behavior	8.03	(122)	4.65
15. Law & Human Behavior	7.91	(99)	4.07
16. Federal Probation	7.78	(190)	4.27
17. Criminal Justice Review	7.52	(120)	3.19
18. Acta Criminologica	6.98	(101)	3.62
19. Abstracts on Police Science	5.92	(108)	3.52
20. American J. of Corrections	5.91	(171)	3.21
21. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	5.75	(132)	2.97
22. Police	5.37	(142)	3.58
23. Police Chief	4.80	(157)	3.67

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 14
Mean Journal Weights Assigned by ASC/ACJS Members (publishing in the journal)

Journal Publication[a]	$\bar{X}$/recognition[b]		SD
1. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	11.86	(7)	3.02
2. Criminology	11.24	(29)	6.40
3. Journal of Police Science & Admin.	10.89	(19)	9.80
4. Social Problems	10.75	(8)	5.31
5. Crime and Delinquency	10.33	(15)	4.34
6. British Journal of Criminology	10.30	(5)	1.86
7. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY	10.00		
8. Inter. Jour. of Criminology & Penology	9.89	(9)	2.15
9. Journal of Criminal Justice	9.62	(21)	3.09
10. Criminal Justice & Behavior	8.78	(9)	3.03
11. Federal Probation	8.17	(23)	3.46
12. LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	7.58	(12)	2.43
13. Criminal Justice Review	7.30	(10)	3.80
14. Abstracts on Police Science	7.20	(5)	2.59
15. Police	4.55	(11)	1.97
16. Police Chief	4.42	(26)	2.94
17. American J. of Corrections	3.93	(13)	2.47

[a]The weight for the JCLC was given on the questionnaire; it was not assigned by the respondents.
[b]Means are shown only where the N is five or more.

Table 15
Stepwise Multiple Regressions of Journal Productivity on the Professionalism

RELATIONSHIPS	b	B	SE	F
Journal Productivity with:				
AUTO	−.131	−.115*	.036	13.11
ORGAN	−.122	−.101*	.039	9.58
PUBLIC	.092	.092*	.033	8.00
SELFREG	−.069	.069*	.336	4.18
CALLING	−.051	.047	.372	1.88

*We considered (B) significant if it was twice its standard error.

Summary/Conclusions

This research examined three general issues. First, professionalism levels of criminal justice educators were estimated. Here, we found ASC members the most professional, followed by ASC/ACJS, and ACJS members. However, differences among the categories were slight, and generally, none scored in the highly professional range. At best, criminal justice educators can be viewed as moderately professional. Secondly, criminal justice publications were ranked. Considerable variation existed among the membership categories on the journals weighted most highly, but there was general agreement on the lowest weighted journals. For the most part, both ASC and ASC/ACJS members weighted the more sociological publications more highly than did ACJS members, and ACJS members weighted the criminal justice publications more highly. Finally, the relationship between professionalism and journal publication productivity was assessed. The results proved inconclusive, with professionalism accounting for only a very small percentage (4 percent) of the total variation in journal productivity.

What do we do next? The criminal justice discipline needs continued research examining the "sociology of criminal justice." The discipline must learn more about its operations and its operators, if it expects to promote its needs and merits on university campuses. This research was designed as a starting point.

Based on the results presented in this research a "Pandora's box" has been opened. Many research issues were touched on, and the definitive answer was offered for none of them. Future research on the sociology of criminal justice must continue in the direction commenced here, as well as moving in other directions. Simply, further research is needed on research issues addressed here, and research is needed on issues we were unable to touch upon.

It is time for the criminal justice discipline to realize research examining the nature and scope of the discipline is essential. With luck, such research will act to

give the discipline focus and direction; both are needed. It is anticipated that with focus and direction the discipline will be placed in a more advantageous position when promoting itself on university campuses.

Notes

1. When using the term "criminal justice," we are referring to programs, faculties, and students whose main focus is researching, teaching, and learning about issues related to police, courts, and corrections. We could have as easily used the term "criminology," but chose not to, since we view criminal justice as being more inclusive.

2. The 18 remaining respondents claimed no affiliation with either ASC or ACJS. We included their responses, however, in the overall summary. Our sample includes only American criminologists (non-students/non-practitioners).

3. Journals selected for inclusion were those the researchers deemed most relevant to criminology and criminal justice. In creating the list, personal bias enters in, along with budgetary and page limitation restraints. Unfortunately, some relevant journals (e.g., *Journal of Legal Studies*), as some respondents pointed out, were omitted; less relevant ones were included. Initially, we decided to limit the number of journals listed to one type-written page; 23 journals were selected. Our standard, *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (JCLC) was selected by the reputational method. Prior to establishing a standard, we decided, the standard (1) must be criminology and/or criminal justice publication and (2) it should not be the official journal of either The American Society of Criminology or Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Then, we telephoned a sample of 50 criminal justice educators and asked what was the most prestigous journal in the field. After omitting responses not reflecting a criminal justice publication or representing ASC or ACJS, the overwhelming choice was *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, mentioned by over 90 percent of the telephoned respondents.

4. We purposely did not ask respondents about either their text-book writing or professional-book writing activities. At the time, it made intuitive sense. We decided we could not determine any feasible mechanism for evaluating such publications. We object to assigning weights in excess of those assigned certain journal publications, because in many cases a book is no more or less meritorious than a journal article. So, we objected to the practice of assigning a book a score 3 times that assigned the highest ranking journal. Some books are worthy of such high weights; others are not. Until a weighting system can be devised (perhaps based on publisher prestige) accurately reflecting a book's merit, we will refrain from including such in estimating "productivity."

5. We recognize the argument could be made that journal productivity determines professionalism level, yet we believe otherwise. Unfortunately with a cross-sectional design (as opposed to a longitudinal one) it is not possible for us to test any other relationship between professionalism and journal productivity than the one advanced. What is needed is research similar to this project, but longitudinally designed. Without such, we simply must struggle within the constraints imposed.

References

Becker, Howard S., *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Dillman, Donald A., *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Glenn, Norval, "American Sociologists' Evaluations of Sixty-three Journals," *The American Sociologist* 6:298-303.

Gross, Edward, *Work and Society*. New York: Crowell, 1958.

Hall, Richard, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," *American Sociological Review* 33:92-104.

Poole, Eric, and Robert Regoli, "Alienation in Prison: An Examination of the Work Relations of Prison Guards," *Criminology*. (Forthcoming issue).

Ritzer, George, "Professionalism and the Individual," in E. Friedson (ed.), *The Professions and Their Prospects*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage, 1973, pp. 59-94.

Snizek, William, "Hall's Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Assessment," *American Sociological Review*, 37:109-14.

Vollmer, Howard M., and Donald L. Mills (eds.), *Professionalization*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Appendix A
The Survey Questionnaire

The Professionalization of Criminology and Criminal Justice

This survey is designed to better understand the criminology and criminal justice professions. Please answer all of the questions. If you wish to comment on any questions, please feel free to use the space in the margins. Your comments will be read, taken into account, and treated confidentially. This research is being sponsored by the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards.

Please return this questionnaire, in the envelope provided to:

Professions Project Center
Department of Sociology
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

PART 1: We would like to begin by asking you about professionalism in your occupation. Please read each statement carefully and decide whether it is one with which you *strongly agree* (SA), *agree* (A), *disagree* (D), strongly disagree (SD), or are *undecided* (U). Circle your response.

1. If ever an occupation is indispensible it is this one	SA	A	D	SD	U
2. The dedication of academicians in my discipline is most gratifying	SA	A	D	SD	U
3. My own decisions are subject to review	SA	A	D	SD	U
4. I believe that the professional organizations should be supported	SA	A	D	SD	U
5. My fellow academicians have a pretty good idea about each other's competence	SA	A	D	SD	U
6. My job gives me a chance to do the things I do best	SA	A	D	SD	U

7. Most academicians would remain in the profession even if their salaries were reduced .	SA	A	D	SD	U
8. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation	SA	A	D	SD	U
9. A problem in my profession is that no one really knows what his fellow academicians are doing	SA	A	D	SD	U
10. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society	SA	A	D	SD	U
11. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than is mine	SA	A	D	SD	U
12. The professional organizations do not really do too much for the average academician	SA	A	D	SD	U
13. I very much like the type of work that I am doing	SA	A	D	SD	U
14. There is really no way to judge a fellow academician's competence	SA	A	D	SD	U
15. I regularly attend professional meetings at the national and/or regional level	SA	A	D	SD	U
16. The importance of being an academician is sometimes overstressed	SA	A	D	SD	U
17. I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work	SA	A	D	SD	U
18. I really don't feel a sense of pride as a result of the type of work that I do	SA	A	D	SD	U
19. There is not much opportunity to judge how another academician does his/her work	SA	A	D	SD	U
20. I don't have an opportunity to exercise my own judgment	SA	A	D	SD	U
21. I systematically read the professional journals	SA	A	D	SD	U
22. There are very few academicians who don't really believe in their work	SA	A	D	SD	U
23. My work gives me a feeling of pride in having done the job well	SA	A	D	SD	U
24. People in my profession have a real "calling" for their work	SA	A	D	SD	U
25. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people in the institution in which I work	SA	A	D	SD	U
26. Although I would like to, I really don't read the professional journals too often	SA	A	D	SD	U
27. My fellow academicians pretty much know how well we all do in our work	SA	A	D	SD	U
28. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by the members of my department	SA	A	D	SD	U
29. My work is my most rewarding experience	SA	A	D	SD	U
30. Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine	SA	A	D	SD	U

Part 2: On the following page are questions designed to assess your opinions regarding criminology and criminal justice journal publications. Please assign weights to them (listed alphabetically) in accordance with your judgment of the *average* importance of their contributions to the criminology/criminal justice field. Use articles in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (JCLC)* as your standard reference. A weight of 10.0 has arbitrarily been assigned to an article in the JCLC, so that a publication only half as important as *JCLC* should be assigned a weight of 5, a type of publication twice as important as JCLC should be assigned a weight of 20, and so forth.

If you do not know enough about a journal to assign a weight to its articles, please place an X in the space provided *for the weight*.

	# of Articles Published in	Journal Publication	Weight
31.	_____	Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology	10.0
32.	_____	Abstracts on Police Science	_____
33.	_____	Acta Criminologica	_____
34.	_____	American Journal of Corrections	_____
35.	_____	American Journal of Sociology	_____
36.	_____	American Sociological Review	_____
37.	_____	British Journal of Criminology	_____
38.	_____	Crime & Delinquency	_____
39.	_____	Crime & Social Justice	_____
40.	_____	Criminal Justice & Behavior	_____
41.	_____	Criminal Justice Review	_____
42.	_____	Criminology	_____
43.	_____	Federal Probation	_____
44.	_____	Inter. Journal of Criminology & Penology	_____
45.	_____	Journal of Criminal Justice	_____
46.	_____	Journal of Police Science & Administration	_____
47.	_____	Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency	_____
48.	_____	LAE Journal of Criminal Justice	_____
49.	_____	Law & Human Behavior	_____
50.	_____	Law & Society Review	_____
51.	_____	Police	_____
52.	_____	Police Chief	_____
53.	_____	Social Problems	_____

Now, go back through the publications list and indicate the number of articles you have had published in each journal. If you have not had an article published in a particular journal, leave the space blank.

PART 3: Finally we would like to ask a few questions about you for purposes of our summaries. Remember that your answers are strictly confidential. They will not be identified with you personally.

54. Do you have any paid criminal justice agency experience?

( ) Yes
( ) No

55. If you answered *Yes* to question 54 above, please indicate the criminal justice agency for which you worked and the number of years employed. Check all that apply.

Agency	Number of years experience
( ) Police	_____
( ) Courts	_____
( ) Corrections	_____

56. Which of the following organizations are you a member of? Check all that apply.

( ) Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
( ) American Society of Criminology

57. Why did you initially enter academia? Check only one.

( ) Job security and related fringe benefits
( ) The nature of the work
( ) Because of the occupation's social prestige

58. Why do you remain in academia? Check only one.

( ) Job security and related fringe benefits
( ) The nature of the work
( ) Because of the occupation's social prestige

59. From what college or university did you earn your highest degree?

_____

60. What is the highest academic degree (e.g., Ph.D.) you have completed?

_____

61. In completing your highest degree, what was your major area of study (e.g., sociology, anthropology, criminal justice)?

_____

62. What is your academic classification?

( ) Instructor
( ) Assistant Professor
( ) Associate Professor
( ) Full Professor
( ) Professor Emeritus
( ) Other (specify) _____

63. What is the highest degree offered in your college or university?

( ) Associate degree
( ) Bachelors degree
( ) Masters degree
( ) Doctorate degree

64. What is the highest degree offered in your department?

( ) Associate degree
( ) Bachelors degree
( ) Masters degree
( ) Doctorate degree

66. How many years have you been teaching in a college and/or university?

_____years

67. What is your age?

_____years

68. What is your sex?

( ) Female
( ) Male

69. Your (not family) 1978 income before taxes

( ) Less than $15,000
( ) $15,000 to $19,999
( ) $20,000 to $24,000
( ) $25,000 to $29,000
( ) $30,000 or more

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the professionalization of criminology and/or criminal justice. If so, please use this space for that purpose.

Also, any comments you wish to make that you think may help us in future efforts to understand the professionalization process within either criminology or criminal justice will be appreciated, either here or in a separate letter.

Your contribution to this effort is sincerely appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope (NOT on this questionnaire). We will see that you get it.

Professions Project Center
1978

Appendix B
Modified Form of Hall's Professionalism Scale

Organization as Major Referent

1. I believe the professional organizations should be supported.
2. I systematically read the professional journals.
3. I regularly attend the professional meetings at the national and/or regional level.
4. The professional organizations do not really do too much for the average academician.
5. Although I would like to, I really don't read the professional journals too often.

Belief in Public Service

6. If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one.
7. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine is.
8. The importance of being an academician is sometimes overstressed.
9. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
10. Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine is.

Belief in Autonomy

11. I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
12. I don't have an opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
13. My own decisions are subject to review.
14. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
15. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people in the institution in which I work.

Belief in Self-Regulation

16. My fellow academicians pretty much know how well we all do in our work.
17. There is not much opportunity to judge how another academician does his/her work.
18. A problem in my profession is that no one really knows what his fellow academicians are doing.
19. My fellow academicians have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
20. There is really no way to judge a fellow academician's competence.

Sense of Calling to the Field

21. There are very few academicians who don't really believe in their work.
22. Most academicians would remain in the profession even if their salaries were reduced.
23. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by the members of my department.
24. The dedication of academicians in my discipline is most gratifying.
25. People in my profession have a real "calling" for their work.